



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

A2 History 2041

HIS3H

Unit 3H

**Monarchies and Republics in France,
1815–1875**

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for A2

The A2 History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since a good historian must be able to combine a range of skills and knowledge. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on their synoptic understanding and linkage of ideas. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(b)) and will have access to the higher mark ranges.

To obtain an award of Level 3 or higher, candidates will need to address the synoptic requirements of A Level. The open-ended essay questions set are, by nature, synoptic and encourage a range of argument. Differentiation between performance at Levels 3, 4, and 5 therefore depends on how a candidate's knowledge and understanding are combined and used to support an argument and the how that argument is communicated.

The mark scheme emphasises features which measure the extent to which a candidate has begun to '*think like a historian*' and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, candidates will show their historical understanding by:

- The way the requirements of the question are interpreted
- The quality of the arguments and the range/depth/type of material used in support
- The presentation of the answer (including the level of communication skills)
- The awareness and use of differing historical interpretations
- The degree of independent judgement and conceptual understanding shown

It is expected that A2 candidates will perform to the highest level possible for them and the requirements for Level 5, which demands the highest level of expertise have therefore been made deliberately challenging in order to identify the most able candidates.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

June 2010

A2 Unit 3: The State and the People: Change and Continuity

HIS3H: Monarchies and Republics in France, 1815–1875

Question 1

- 01** 'The ultra-conservatives were responsible for the failure of the Bourbon monarchy.'
With reference to the years 1815 to 1830, assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**

L5: Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written.

38-45

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

This framing of this question invites a variety of responses: yes, it was the Ultras; no it was not, it was the fault of the Bourbon Kings (or perhaps nobody's fault because the project was doomed from the start); up to a point it was the ultras fault but other factors, especially short-term problems in 1830. The key requirement is for a clear, balanced argument, supported by appropriate selected evidence.

The Bourbon restoration was consciously designed to eliminate the germs of revolution from France – to prevent any return to republicanism and also to block any repeat of the aggressive expansion of French power in Europe such as that led by revolutionary and Napoleonic France since 1793. Some candidates are likely to argue that the very fact that the Bourbon settlement of 1814–1815 was imposed by foreign powers made it certain that the restoration would fail. They may argue that it was more than 20 years since the execution of Louis XVI, and that Bourbon rule could not be put back together again.

But many answers will agree with the thrust of the key quotation and will argue there was a chance of success up to 1824/5 before the Ultras influenced the King into steering the ship of state onto the rocks.

A third approach might argue that the constitutional monarchy did much better than it has been given credit for and with a focus on the short-term factors involved in the 1830 revolution and the impact of key groups and personalities.

There is a wide range of relevant material – the supporting evidence will need to be selective, not comprehensive. Evidence might include:

Other Factors (Long-Term):

- the restoration came 'in the baggage-train of the allies'
- the long gap of a quarter-century since 1789 and the deep impact of revolutionary ideas and the Napoleonic system had weakened the aristocratic ruling class and strengthened the bourgeoisie
- symbolic divisions over the re-instatement of the Bourbon white flag
- the promising reaction to the King's moderate Constitutional Charter.

Other Factors (Short-Term):

- bad harvests and inflation (especially food prices)
- business failures
- reaction against government attempts to muzzle opposition
- the 'Trois Glorieuses' – 3 days of insurrection in July 1830 *Entrenched*

The Ultras:

- Ultra-conservative attitudes in the nobility and the church
- personal failings of Louis XVIII
- the avoidable errors of the hard-line Ultras
- the Sacrilege Law of 1825
- the significance of the mistaken policies of Charles X from 1824.

Question 2

- 02** 'All French governments in the years 1831 to 1870 were failures in foreign affairs.'
Assess the validity of this view (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

This question requires an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of French foreign policy under Louis Philippe, the Second Republic and Napoleon III. There is a range of possible arguments and the opportunity for differentiated assessments – perhaps agreeing with the key quotation about continuous failure, perhaps rejecting that idea as simplistic, perhaps seeing episodes of success interspersed with specific failures. Answers cannot be expected to be comprehensive or even in coverage but it is essential to address the period 1831 to 1870 as a whole, even if some aspects are covered in more depth and detail.

Evidence might include:**Louis Philippe:**

- successful intervention in Belgium – but unable to prevent Belgian independence
- failure to break anti-French policies of other powers in Holy Alliance
- prestige gained through colonial empire – Algeria, Senegal and Tahiti
- support for Mehemet Ali failed to achieve all objectives but did secure French influence in Egypt
- perceived failure to extend control over Luxembourg and Rhineland.

Second Republic:

- weak position because of hostility of foreign powers to all revolutionary and republican regimes in 1848–1849
- failed attempt to conciliate Papacy by visit to Rome goods
- failure to prevent return of Louis-Napoleon to France – and rapid recognition of Napoleon III after his coup proved failure of Second Republic to gain legitimacy.

Napoleon III:

- initial success of policies towards Austria & Prussia but underrated rise of Prussia
- initial success for supporting nationalism and liberalism, especially in Italy – but bad failure in Mexico and failure in long term to control Italian unification
- gained recognition abroad for his dynasty
- successful policies towards Germany in 1860s (e.g. Spain) but overreached and caused his own downfall by Franco-Prussian War.

Question 3

- 03** 'The Third Republic survived only because of the mistakes of its opponents.'
With reference to the years 1870 to 1875 assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

This question has a broad synoptic focus, encompassing the upheavals of France and the difficult birth of the Third Republic between 1870 and 1875. The central theme – the survival of the new regime and triumph of republicanism – includes the important implicit questions about why the Third Republic was in danger of not surviving and a very direct question about why the royalists who tried to suppress the Third Republic were unable to achieve success despite their apparent political and religious strengths. Some answers will firmly agree with the key quotation, focusing on the divisions between the rival monarchist factions and the narrowness of the outcome of the Wallon Amendment in 1875. Others will ascribe republican success to long-term trends in the society and economy of France, which were moving away from clerical conservatism towards a modern middle class industrialized society.

Evidence might include:**Weaknesses of the Third Republic:**

- dangerous political vacuum after fall of Second Empire
- weaknesses of republicanism (perhaps linked to 1848–1851) and divisions between moderates and radicals
- the Paris Commune and its impact.

The monarchist threat: strengths and weaknesses:

- strength of the Catholic Church
- anti-republican attitudes in the Army
- monarchist cause divided between three rival claimant
- stubborn stupidity of the Bourbon traditionalists.

Strengths of the Third Republic 1870–1875:

- conviction that ‘the republic divides us least’
- impact of economic modernization and growth of the middle class
- new generation of capable republican politicians
- reasons why the Wallon Amendment was passed.

** Note that some candidates may make effective use here of ideas and evidence relating to the development of the Third Republic after 1875. Such material should be rewarded appropriately if it is precisely applied to a relevant argument in answer to the question but it is by no means essential.